

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE      | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/389,393      | 09/03/1999       | HISASHI OHTANI       | 07977/204002            | 5375             |
| 20985           | 7590 04/17/2002  |                      |                         |                  |
|                 | CHARDSON, PC     |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| SUITE 500       | LA VILLAGE DRIVE |                      | BAUMEISTER,             | BRADLEY W        |
| SAN DIEGO       | , CA 92122       |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                 |                  |                      | 2815                    |                  |
|                 |                  |                      | DATE MAILED: 04/17/2002 | 2                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 1 | X |  |
|---|---|--|
| · |   |  |

Application No. Applicant(s)

B. William Baumeister

09/389,393

Examiner

Art Unit

2815



## **Advisory Action**

|                     | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |
|---------------------|--|
| Therefore rejection | EPLY FILED <u>Apr 3, 2002</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. ore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final on under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for nce; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   |
|                     | THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]   |
|                     | The period for reply expires3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.   |
|                     | In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |
| exto<br>app         | ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate ension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The ropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ling date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |
| 1.□                 | A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |
| 2. 🗆                | The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.   |
| 3. 🛛                | The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |
| (a) <sup>[</sup>    | they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);  |
|                     | X they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);  |
|                     | they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or   |
| (d) [               | they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |
| ı                   | NOTE: The proposed amendment reciting first and second insulating layers requires further consideration/search.  |
|                     | Also, the amendment does not address the new-matter issue raised in par. 5 of the last Office Action (#15).  |
| 4. 🗆                | Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |
| 5.□                 | Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  |
| 6. 🗆                | The a) $\square$ affidavit, b) $\square$ exhibit, or c) $\square$ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:   |
| 7. 🗆                | The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |
| 8. 🕱                | For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):   |
|                     | Claim(s) allowed: 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 29, 30, and 33-37  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 22, 25-27, 31, 32, and 38   |
| - 53                |  |
| 9.🗓                 | The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>Feb 28, 2002</u> and has both has not been approved by the Examiner  |
|                     | Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).  |
| 11.🛭                | Other:The drawings still do not show the claimed embodiment of a bottom gate structure.  EDDIE LEE  SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  |

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800 Part of Paper No. 18